

THE NATIONAL ERA.

WASHINGTON, MARCH 4, 1847.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION—ANTI-SLAVERY MEN.

We proceed at once to notice the following resolutions of the State Liberty Convention of Massachusetts:

Resolved, That, to secure human rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just power from the consent of the governed—but the power and scope of such governments cannot extend so far as to conflict with the natural rights of man, or be inconsistent with the principles of natural justice.

Resolved, That the Constitution of the United States does not establish slavery, nor give it any legal existence; nor does it, by any fair interpretation, sanction it, within the States. Nor could it so sanction it, even had its framers so intended, inasmuch as slavery had at that time no legal existence in any of the States of the Union. Because, first, the colonial charters did not authorize it. Secondly, the trade between the colonies and Africa was never legalized by Great Britain. Thirdly, the decision of the Court of King's Bench, in the case of Somerset, in 1772, settled the law of the land, as applicable to the Colonies as to any part of Great Britain. Fourthly, the Declaration of Independence, in 1776, became a fundamental law of the land, with which slavery was necessarily inconsistent. Fifthly, none of the Constitutions of the then States recognize it. And, sixthly, because slavery is inconsistent with natural right and justice, and is established by no law, but is limited by the rights of man, and is beyond the limits of rightful constitutional and legislative authority.

The first resolution affirms, that "the power and scope" of a government founded upon the consent of the governed, "cannot extend so far as to conflict with the natural rights of man, or be inconsistent with the principles of natural justice." No comment upon this would be needed, were it not for the doctrine, recently broached by some, that law is no law unless it be a righteous one—a doctrine with no other force than that derived from a mere play on words. Whether the "power and scope" of such a government as that of the United States is a mere question of fact, or the right to violate "the natural rights of man, or act inconsistently with the principles of natural justice," certainly exists nowhere. But that "the power and scope" (the last term meaning design or purpose) of such a government may extend so "far as to conflict with natural rights," is proved by the fact, that some fifteen Governments in this country are continually sanctioning and enforcing the violation of such rights.

"Ah! but they are not just Governments," it is said. True. Is it then meant by the proposition, that no just government can, in its provisions, "conflict with natural rights and the principles of natural justice"? This is a truism—a principle of government cannot at the same time be an unjust one.

But it is the second resolution which deserves special comment. It is often remarked, that it is unwise to make any concession to slavery. And not only unwise, but indefensible. But it is always proper to make concessions demanded by the truth. An unadvised argument or an erroneous statement, put forth against slavery, tends to strengthen its claims.

We agree with the declaration, that the Constitution of the United States does not establish slavery, or give it any legal existence. We go further, and affirm, that it confers no power upon the Government to establish slavery, or give it legal existence. Nor does it give any legal sanction to the system. But by no means do we assent to the position that "it could not have given such a sanction, even had its framers so intended," nor do we admit the truth generally of the allegations made in support of this position.

1. As to the Colonial Charters, we shall say nothing about them, for we have no opportunity now to examine them. But, so far as we remember, they did not prohibit the establishment of slavery, and were not repugnant to it.

2. On what ground the second statement is made, we are at a loss to understand. The trade in slaves between the Colonies and Africa was recognized as a legal commerce—was sanctioned by the Crown—was perpetuated by the use of the royal veto, in opposition to the express will of some of the colonies. These facts attest by history. So far back as the year 1752, the Legislature of Virginia began to legislate on the freedom of the Colonies. The duties upon slave importation were increased, from time to time, till, in 1772, they amounted to about forty per cent. In the same year, a petition on the subject was presented to the Throne, from the House of Burgesses of Virginia. It says that the commerce in slaves had "long been considered as a trade of great inhumanity, and under its present enlargement," it threatened the existence of His Majesty's colonies. After showing that though some of his Majesty's subjects of Great Britain might reap emolument from it, it greatly retarded the settlement of the colonies; it concluded as follows:

"Deeply impressed with these sentiments, we most humbly beseech your Majesty to renew all these restraints on your Majesty's Governors of this colony, which prohibit their assenting to such laws as might check so very pernicious a commerce."

How does this plain statement of facts consist with the declaration that the trade in slaves was never legalized by Great Britain? In the Constitution of Virginia, "the inhuman use of the royal veto" in refusing permission to exclude slaves from the colonies, was assigned as one of the reasons for separating from Great Britain. Besides, why was it found necessary to agitate so long and earnestly to procure a law abolishing the slave trade between Africa and the British dominions, if that trade was never legalized by Great Britain?

3. The third statement is, that "the decision of the Court of King's Bench, in the case of Somerset, in 1772, settled the law of the land, as applicable to the colonies as to any part of Great Britain." That cannot be true; slavery was compensation allowed by the British Government to our, for slaves owned in this country, wrecked upon the Bermuda Islands before the abolition of slavery there. It will be recollected that our Government, with a pertinacious fidelity to the slave power, ever characteristic of it, demanded compensation for slaves in certain vessels, the *Encomium*, *Comet*, and *Hermione*, wrecked on the British West India Islands, whereby the slaves were freed free. One of the vessels was lost prior to the act of abolition in the colonies; the other two slaves on board that vessel, if we recollect aright, compensation was awarded; the principle was thus recognized, that the colonies being slaveholding, the decision in the case of Somerset did not apply to them. Compensation was denied in the other cases, because the transaction took place after the abolition of slavery in the Islands.

4. It is said, fourthly, that "the Declaration of Independence, in 1776, became a fundamental law of the land, with which slavery was necessarily inconsistent." Doubtless slavery, in any form, is inconsistent with the Declaration of Independence; but where is the authority for saying that this became the fundamental law of the land? The people of the colonies did not so declare. Nothing in the Declaration itself gives countenance to this idea. The Supreme Court of the United States has never so ruled. The Constitution of the United States, being a compact between the States, and not the ultimate sovereignty of the people, does not so recognize it. Let us not impose an agreeable fiction upon our own minds. That Declaration was put forth by the representatives of slaveholding colonies, not as a law, but as a vindication of their separation from Great Britain. In this Declaration, there is no mention of slaves as the foundation of all just government, and thereby came under a moral obligation to carry out those principles faithfully in their own case; but they did not claim them as the fundamental law of the Government they were about to originate. Nor could these principles have any legal force over them, until declared to be law. When they came to form the Constitution, their language was this: "We do hereby ordain and establish this Constitution." &c. This is the "fundamental and the only fundamental law of the

land. We could wish it were otherwise. We wish it could be said, with truth, that the Declaration of Independence had been ordained and established by our forefathers as the fundamental law of the land. But we cannot go beyond the record, and believe without evidence.

5. "Fifthly, None of the Constitutions of the then States recognized it." This is scarcely true. Several of the Constitutions of the States at the adoption of the Constitution, contained various provisions recognizing indirectly the condition of slavery. For example, they provided that no "free man" should be deprived of the right of liberty without, &c., and that every "free man" should be entitled to vote, &c. This certainly was a recognition of the fact that there were or might be slaves in those commonwealths, and excluded these slaves from certain privileges.

But, what matter if the Constitutions of the then States did not recognize it? The laws did. In fact, slavery was a part of the social structure. Slaves were first introduced into Virginia in the year 1620. They increased steadily from that time till, in 1776, they constituted a large portion of the inhabitants of the States. During all this period, laws were continually made, recognizing them as slaves; and it does really seem like availing to deny, that what had been in existence for more than a century, was imbedded in the local institutions of a State, recognized and guarded by all its laws, and was a component part of the basis of its social system, was not legalized, because not written expressly in the Constitution.

In the year 1663, a law was passed in Virginia, by which all children born in the country "were declared to be bond or free, according to the condition of the mother." In 1667, it was declared that "the conferring of baptism doth not alter the condition of the person baptized, as to his bondage or freedom. This was done that the new masters, freed from this doubt, may more carefully advance the propagating of Christianity, by permitting the well-founded suspicions of the natives, that all 'servants' brought into this country, by sea or land, not being Christians, whether Moors, Mulattoes, or Indians, except Turks and Moors in amity with Great Britain, and all Indians which should be sold by neighboring Indians, or any others trafficking with us, as slaves, should be slaves to all intents and purposes whatsoever." This act was re-enacted in 1705, and afterwards in 1733.

Here, then, are numerous laws ordaining the condition of slavery, dominating certain persons to that condition, establishing and perpetuating the slaveholding relation, which had already existed for more than a century under the guarantees of the law; and yet the assertion is made, that, at the time of the Constitution adoption, it was not legalized in a single colony! What is true of Virginia is true of all the colonies. It was legalized in Pennsylvania and New York. Else, why did Pennsylvania, and New York, and New Jersey, feel it necessary to pass laws abolishing the condition?

6. "Sixthly, Because slavery is inconsistent with natural right and justice, and its establishment lies beyond the limit of rightful constitutional and legislative authority." That is, slavery had no legal existence in any of the States of this Union, because its establishment lies beyond the limit of rightful constitutional and legislative authority. We respectfully submit that this is a *non sequitur*. It would be as wise to say that slavery has no right of legal existence, because its establishment lies beyond the limit of rightful constitutional and legislative authority; or that it has no legal existence, because its establishment lies beyond the limit of constitutional and legal authority; but, certainly, the premise—the establishment of slavery "lies beyond the limit of rightful constitutional and legislative authority"—does not warrant the conclusion that it has no legal existence. For there are bad as well as good laws. There is as wrongful as well as rightful constitutional and legislative authority. An institution may be legal according to human enactment, and illegal according to divine enactment.

In other words, the most wrongful systems and practices may be legalized, although that act by no means changes their character, or releases from guilt any one who may choose to support them.

7. In closing, we would state, that we have on hand two communications—one maintaining the old, the other advocating the new doctrines. We shall publish the former next week, the latter the week after. A full comparison of views will be profitable. We speak only for ourselves.

THE BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF IRELAND.

The bill appropriating \$500,000 for the relief of the people of Ireland passed the Senate last Saturday evening by a decided majority. We dislike to expect much more, but it is one of the innumerable bills which politicians are subjected to that they never appear in a more uncertain light than when dealing in public charity. We could not help remembering that this bill was introduced, sustained, and carried through, chiefly by the co-operation of rival aspirants for the Presidency.

But, whence the power of Congress to pass such a bill? Is it our Government, indeed, one of delegated powers? Is it true that it has no rights conferred by the Constitution? Such is the doctrine of the State rights men; such, particularly is the creed of Mr. Calhoun and the Democratic party. But two of the most ardent supporters of this bill were Mr. Calhoun and Gen. Cass! Think of that! Where do they find in the Constitution power vested in the Government to appropriate the money of the people of the United States to charity? Where is the authority that it is written, that the Federal Government shall be the almoner of the Republic? That it shall have power to take money from my pocket, to buy clothes or breadstuffs for the poor of other lands? There are powers conferred to do certain things, and the right to appropriate moneys necessary to give efficiency to the exercise of such powers is an essential incident. But nowhere is any power conferred to convert the Treasury of the United States into a charity fund.

There is just as much power conferred by the Constitution to do either of these things, as to give money to relieve the poor of Ireland. We said, the right to appropriate moneys from the Treasury was a necessary incident to the powers of legislation conferred by the Constitution. By the extent of these powers, therefore, must be determined, where no power of legislation is conferred, this right does not exist. But there is a clause which expressly confers this right to appropriate moneys, and in so doing defines its limits. Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises—"for what purpose?" "to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States." Where in this clause do you find any power vested in the Government to become grand almoner of the United States, and impose upon the people compulsory almsgiving? We did not hear all the debate, but were informed that Mr. Calhoun justified himself on this ground—the Federal Government, so far as the States were concerned, was purely one of delegated authority, exercise no power that was not delegated; that, in all our external relations, it was supreme, and enjoyed original and inherent powers. This is a beautiful doctrine to be put forth by a strict constructionist! If true, how happens it that the framers of the Constitution deemed it necessary to confer, in express terms, the powers to be exercised by the General Government over our external or foreign relations? A reference to the preamble, and the Constitution itself, demonstrate that, as it regards all our external or foreign rela-

tions, the Government has no other than delegated powers. The Constitution confers upon Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations;" "to lay imposts;" "to define and punish piracies committed on the high seas, and offences against the laws of nations;" "to declare war;" and invests the President with power, "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, and appoint ambassadors, other ministers, and consuls."

These are powers conferred expressly by the Constitution, which is just as particular in defining them in regard to foreign nations, as in defining them in regard to external or internal relations. The distinction of Mr. Calhoun is a groundless abstraction, utterly discreditable to a student of the history of the country.

We need hardly say that we have as much sympathy for the people of Ireland as any other man. We have proved this by deeds, not words. But, let the people do their own good works—let the almoners of their own bounty. Already, we doubt not, the voluntary contributions of the people amount to half a million of dollars in value. Why not let them vote in their lovely work of charity? God loves a cheerful giver. Compelled benevolence we shudder. Contributions to relieve the suffering, from the people of the United States, acting under the impulse of an unconstrained, heavenly philanthropy, to the people of Ireland, are graceful, and will prove all-powerful. They bless both the giver and receiver. Why should the mere politician step in, and, from lack of wisdom, or with an eye to popularity, or a lust for the Presidency, virtually deprive the people of the high privilege of exercising an ennobling charity? We have full faith in the voluntary principle in matters of religion and philanthropy. It has always effected, and will always effect, infinitely more for the good of mankind and the honor of God than any legislation; and it has this advantage—its good works may be wrought without giving rise to well-founded suspicions of the motives of the donors. Let the Government mind its own business, and not undertake to do what the unimpelled charity of the people will do far better.

THE CAUSES OF THE WAR, &c.

It is somewhat remarkable, that, after three months' consideration, Congress could come to no definite conclusion in regard to the causes of the war. Mr. Soule, of Louisiana, said it was to be found in the right of a people to govern themselves. One hinted that it was the injurious treaty of 1819 with Spain. Mr. Evans, of Maine, insisted that it was the rejection by Mexico of Mr. John Slidell as envoy extraordinary. Mr. Calhoun, with some Democrats and many Whigs, declared that it was the march of the army, by the order of the President, from Corpus Christi to the Rio Grande. A few Democrats vaguely talked about a long standing account of grievances chargeable to Mexico, as being at the bottom of the mischief. But a majority of both Whigs and Democrats argued that the annexation of Texas was the true cause of the war.

And then we heard dissertations on remote and proximate, indirect and immediate causes, with the metaphysical distinction made by Mr. Calhoun, that the proximate cause was the march of the army of the cause, of the war.

Another point, of equal uncertainty, was that of responsibility. Who was responsible? The President? Congress? Or Mr. Calhoun? Mr. Calhoun charged the President with it. Mr. Turner charged Mr. Calhoun. Mr. Hannegan laid the responsibility on Congress.

A third perplexing point, was the plan of the President to make peace. Was it to conquer peace? or buy peace? Was it to conquer the war vigorously, or weary the enemy by delays? Was it to conduct it to a "speedy and honorable termination," by the aid of Mars, Mammon, or Mercury? The President demanded ten additional regiments, and thirty or forty millions, war appropriations; this looked as if we were taking counsel of Mars. He next asked for three millions to enable him to make peace, by becoming a kind of paymaster to Santa Anna; this looked as if Mammon and Mars were in the ascendant.

Congress was sorely puzzled, but, with marvelous good nature, yielded all that was demanded by his Excellency. They laid all their scruples and perplexities at his feet, doubting not, that what was dark to them was sunshine to his remarkable mind.

But the great problem of the session was to determine the objects of the war. Some said it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary question. Others, that it was to compel Mexico to receive John Slidell as Minister, instead of Mr. John Slidell. Others, that it was to obtain indemnity for the war expenses, which would be as a high wayman should send in to the poor fellow he had beaten and robbed a bill of charges for the trouble and time he had taken in doing it. Others, that it was to punish Mexico for the repeated injuries and insults she had inflicted on us. Others, that it was to recover the debt due by her to our citizens. Others, that it was to settle a boundary

